

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 21, 2007 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 1-69 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 70-101 have been added. Support for the new claims may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **Rejections of Claims 1-22, 27, 50-62, and 67**

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-12, 14-22, 27, 50-55, 57-62, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boyle (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,115 B1). At page 10 of the Office Action, claims 3, 4, 13, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyle. Claims 1-22, 27, 50-62, and 67 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby obviating these rejections. Withdrawal of these rejections therefore is respectfully requested.

### **Addition of New Claims 79-101**

New claims 79-101 have been added. Support for these claims may be found in, *inter alia*, FIG. 4 and its corresponding description and in claims 1-22, 27, 50-62, and 67 as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that the claimed subject matter of claims 79-101 is consonant with the subject matter of claims 1-22, 27, 50-62, and 67 examined by the Office.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest the particular combinations of features recited by new independent claims 70, 84, or 88, as well as by their dependent claims. Independent claim 70 recites the features of: “generating, at a video server, a frame index for a video stream, the frame index comprising a plurality of frame index entries corresponding to a plurality of frames of the video stream,” “receiving, at the video server, a first presentation request for the video stream from a display client via a network, the video server remote to the display client,” “determining, at the video server, a first subset of frames of the plurality of frames and a first presentation sequence for the first subset of frames based on the frame index in response to the first presentation request,” and “transmitting the first subset of frames having the

first presentation sequence to the display client via the network.” Independent claim 88 recites similar features.

Boyle teaches “creating a look-up table of the logical block addresses (LBAs) . . . of the frames of” an incoming video stream at a digital video recording system, such as a personal video recorder (PVR). *See Boyle*, Abstract, col. 1, lines 16-48, col. 3, lines 19-37, col. 5, lines 2-5, claims 1, 11, 13, and 24 (note recitation of “display controller” feature). In view of Boyle’s teaching that the digital video recording system includes a display controller to control a display, one of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that the digital video recording system/PVR of Boyle is a local display client, rather than a remote video server. Thus, as Boyle teaches that it is a display client (Boyle’s digital video recording system/PVR) that creates the “look-up table” and processes video frames based on the look-up table, Boyle fails to disclose or suggest a video server remote to a display client that generates a frame index table, receives a presentation request from a display client via a network, determines a subset of frames based on the presentation request received from the display client via the network, and transmits the subset of frames to the display client via the network as provided by independent claims 70 and 88. To illustrate, the Office relies on the passage of Boyle at col. 12, lines 20-32 as allegedly teaching the features of “wherein the presentation request is received from a display client over a network” originally presented by dependent claim 5 (now canceled). Contrary to the Office’s assertion, this relied-upon passage fails to describe the transmission or receipt of a presentation request over a network. In fact, this passage fails to mention a network between a video server and a display client in any manner. Rather, this passage merely teaches that user input can be received via a keyboard or a GUI, which is not the same as or equivalent to a network between a video server and a display client.

New independent claim 84 recites the features of “receiving, at a display client, user input indicating a requested playback of a video stream having a plurality of frames, the requested playback comprising one of a fast-forward playback or a fast-reverse playback,” “generating, at the display client, a presentation request based on the user input,” “transmitting the presentation request from the display client to a video server via a network, the video server remote to the display client,” “receiving, at the display client, a subset of the plurality of frames having a presentation sequence based on the requested playback,” and “processing, at the display client,

the subset of the plurality of frames for display in a display sequence based on the presentation sequence.” As discussed above, Boyle teaches that the generation of the “look-up table” and the processing of the video data based on the look-up table takes place at a PVR/digital video recording system, which would be recognized as comprising a display client, rather than a remote video server. Accordingly, Boyle fails to disclose or suggest that the PVR/digital video recording system provides a presentation request to a video server via a network and receives a subset of frames having a presentation sequence based on the presentation request from the video server via the network.

As Boyle fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by new independent claims 70, 84, and 88, Boyle necessarily fails to disclose or suggest the particular combinations of features of claims 71-83, 85-87, and 89-101 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 70, 84, or 88. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional novel features.

## **Conclusion**

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan S. Davidson/

Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596  
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP  
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200  
Austin, Texas 78730  
(512) 439-7100 (phone) (512) 439-7199 (fax)

November 20, 2007

Date